Inclusive breakup of three-fragment weakly bound and Borromean nuclei

B. V. Carlson
Instituto Tecnológico de Aeronáutica, DCTA,12.228-900 São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil

T. Frederico
Instituto Tecnológico de Aeronáutica, DCTA,12.228-900 São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil

M. S. Hussein
Instituto Tecnológico de Aeronáutica, DCTA,12.228-900 São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil
Instituto de Estudos Avançados, Universidade de São Paulo C. P. 72012, 05508-970 São Paulo-SP, Brazil and
Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C. P. 66318, 05314-970 São Paulo,-SP, Brazil

arXiv:1611.09741v1 [nucl-th] 29 Nov 2016

The inclusive breakup of three-fragment projectiles is discussed within a four-body spectator model. Both the elastic breakup and the non-elastic breakup are obtained in a unified framework. Originally developed in the 80's for two-fragment projectiles such as the deuteron, the theory is successfully generalized to Borromean projectiles. The expression obtained for the inclusive cross section allows the extraction of the incomplete fusion cross section, and accordingly generalizes the surrogate method to cases such as (t,p) and (t,n) reactions. It is found that two-fragment correlations inside the projectile affect in a conspicuous way the elastic breakup cross section. The inclusive non-elastic breakup cross section is found to contain the contribution of a three-body absorption term that is also strongly influenced by the two-fragment correlations.

PACS numbers: 24.10Eq, 25.70.Bc, 25.60Gc

Breakup reactions are of fundamental importance in collisions involving weakly bound quantum systems. [1]. Diatomic molecules, and two-fragment nuclei when scatter from a target may undergo a fragmentation process where one of the ions or the fragment is observed while the other fragment and the target are not. This inclusive breakup process is important as the singles spectra can supply important information about the unobserved two-body subsystem. Here we develop a model to treat inclusive non-elastic break up reactions involving weakly bound three-cluster nuclei. Borromean, two-nucleon, halo nuclei are examples of unstable three-fragments projectiles. The model is based on the theory of inclusive breakup reactions commonly employed in the treatment of incomplete fusion and surrogate method. The theory was developed in the 80's by Ichimura, Autern and Vincent (IAV) [2], Udagawa and Tamura (UT)[3] and Hussein and McVoy (HM) [4]. We extend these three-body theories to derive an expression for the fragment yield in the reaction $A\,(a,b)\,X$, where the projectile is $a = x_1 + x_2 + b$. The inclusive breakup cross section is found to be the sum of a generalized four-body form of the elastic breakup cross section plus the inclusive non-elastic breakup cross section that involves the "reaction" cross section of the participant fragments, x_1 and x_2. The final result is similar to the three-body case reviewed in Austern, et al. [5], but with important genuine four-body effects added, both in the elastic breakup cross section, which now contains the full correlations between the participant fragments, and in the inclusive non-elastic breakup. These developments should encourage experimentalists to seek more information about the $x_1 + x_2$ system in the elastic breakup cross section, and for theorists to further develop and extend the surrogate method, based on the inclusive non-elastic breakup part of the b spectrum.

The many-body Hamiltonian that governs the scattering dynamics of the $b + x_1 + x_2 + A$ system is

$$H = [T_b + T_{x_1} + T_{x_2} + V_{b,x_1} + +V_{b,x_2} + V_{x_1,x_2}]+ \\ [T_A + \sum_{i<j}^{A} V_{ij}] + V_{b,A} + V_{x_1,A} + V_{x_2,A} \quad (1)$$

We use the spectator approximation of replacing the interaction $V_{b,A}$ by the one-body optical potential $U_{b,A}$, and the no-recoil approximation $T_A = 0$. Using the definition of the inclusive breakup cross section exemplified by the singles, b-spectrum and angular distribution, we can then employ general nuclear reaction theory accompanied by operator manipulations as done in [2–5] to reduce the cross section into a sum of two distinct terms, the elastic breakup and the non-elastic breakup cross sections.

Accordingly, the inclusive breakup cross section becomes,

$$\frac{d^2\sigma_b}{dE_b d\Omega_b} = \frac{d^2\sigma_b^{EB}}{dE_b d\Omega_b} + \frac{d^2\sigma_b^{INEB}}{dE_b d\Omega_b} \quad (2)$$

where the four-body elastic breakup cross section is,

$$\frac{d^2\sigma_b^{EB}}{dE_b d\Omega_b} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar v_a}\rho_b(E_b)\int \frac{dk_{x_1}}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{dk_{x_2}}{(2\pi)^3} \times |\langle \chi^{3B(-)}_{x_1,x_2}\chi_b^{(-)}|[V_{bx_1}+V_{bx_2}]|\Psi_0^{4B(+)}\rangle|^2 \times \delta(E-E_b-E_{(\mathbf{k}_{x_1},\mathbf{k}_{x_2})}) \quad (3)$$

and

$$\frac{d^2\sigma_b^{INEB}}{dE_b d\Omega_b} = \frac{2}{\hbar v_a}\rho_b(E_b)\langle\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}|(W_{x_1}+W_{x_2}+W_{3B})|\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}\rangle \quad (4)$$

with the source function

$$\hat{\rho}_X(\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2}) = (\chi_b^{(-)}|\Psi_0^{4B(+)}\rangle = \int d\mathbf{r}_b\left[\chi_b^{(-)}(\mathbf{r}_b)\right]^\dagger \Psi_0^{4B(+)}(\mathbf{r}_b,\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2}) \quad (5)$$

depending only on the coordinates of x_1 and x_2.

The second equation, Eq.(4), is the four-body inclusive non-elastic breakup cross section. It differs significantly from the three-body Austern formula [5]. We refer to Eq.(4) as the Carlson-Frederico-Hussein (CFH) formula. The major new features present can be quantified by writing the formula as a sum of three terms,

$$\frac{d^2\sigma_b^{INEB}}{dE_b d\Omega_b} = \rho_b(E_b)\sigma_R^{4B} \quad (6)$$

$$\sigma_R^{4B} = \frac{k_a}{E_a}\left[\frac{E_{x_1}}{k_{x_1}}\sigma_R^{x_1} + \frac{E_{x_2}}{k_{x_2}}\sigma_R^{x_2} + \frac{E_{CM}(x_1,x_2)}{(k_{x_1}+k_{x_2})}\sigma_R^{3B}\right] \quad (7)$$

where,

$$\sigma_R^{x_1} = \frac{k_{x_1}}{E_{x_1}}\langle\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}|W_{x_1}|\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}\rangle, \quad (8)$$

$$\sigma_R^{x_2} = \frac{k_{x_2}}{E_{x_2}}\langle\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}|W_{x_2}|\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}\rangle, \quad (9)$$

and,

$$\sigma_R^{3B} = \frac{(k_{x_1}+k_{x_2})}{E_{CM}(x_1,x_2)}\ \langle\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}|W_{3B}|\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}\rangle \quad (10)$$

The cross section, $\sigma_R^{x_1}$ represents the absorption of fragment x_1 by the target, while fragment x_2 just scatters off the target through the optical potential U_{x_1A}. The second cross section, $\sigma_R^{x_2}$ is just the exchange of the role of these two fragments; fragment x_2 is captured by the target and fragment x_1 is scattered. Note that these cross sections are different from the one which appears in the three-body theory. The three-body sub-system $x_1 - x_2 - A$ is not treated within the spectator model, while the $b - x - A$ system is. Thus we anticipate that, say, $\sigma_R^{x_1}$ in a (t,p) reaction, will be different from σ_R^x extracted from a (d,p) reaction.

The cross sections, $\sigma_R^{x_1}$, $\sigma_R^{x_2}$, of Eq. (7) are related to the IAV cross section of the three-body theory through a convolution of the latter with the distorted wave densities, namely, $|\chi_{x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_2})|^2$, and $|\chi_{x_1}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1})|^2$, respectively. This can be easily seen if an eikonal-type approximation of the projectile distorted wave, $\chi_a^{(+)} = \chi_b^{(+)}\chi_{x_1}^{(+)}\chi_{x_2}^{(+)}$ is used. These distorted wave densities come from the solutions of a non-Hermitian Schrödinger equation with the respective optical potentials. In Ref. [19], these distorted wave densities were calculated and found to be related to the reaction cross section of x_1 and of x_2. To be more specific, we first write the source function $\hat{\rho}_{HM}^{4B}$, Eq. (5)

$$\langle\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2}|\hat{\rho}_{HM}^{4B}\rangle = \int d\mathbf{r}_b\Phi_{x_1x_2b}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2},\mathbf{r}_b)\langle\chi_b^{(-)}|\chi_b^{(+)}\rangle(\mathbf{r}_b) \times \chi_{x_1}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1})\chi_{x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_2}) \quad (11)$$

The overlap function $\langle\chi_b^{(-)}|\chi_b^{(+)}\rangle(\mathbf{r}_b)$ is the integrand of the elastic S-matrix element of the spectator fragment, b, $S_{\mathbf{k}'_b,\mathbf{k}_b} = \int d\mathbf{r}_b\langle\chi_b^{(-)}|\chi_b^{(+)}\rangle(\mathbf{r}_b)$. Thus, we introduce the internal motion modified S-matrix of the b fragment, $\hat{S}_b(\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2}) \equiv \int d\mathbf{r}_b\Phi_{x_1x_2b}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2},\mathbf{r}_b)\langle\chi_b^{(-)}|\chi_b^{(+)}\rangle(\mathbf{r}_b)$. Accordingly, the source function becomes,

$$\langle\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2}|\hat{\rho}_{HM}^{4B}\rangle = \hat{S}_b(\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2})\chi_{x_1}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1})\chi_{x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_2}) \quad (12)$$

The cross section, $\sigma_R^{x_1}$, Eq. (8), becomes,

$$\frac{E_{x_1}}{k_{x_1}}\sigma_R^{x_1} = \int d\mathbf{r}_{x_1}d\mathbf{r}_{x_2}|\hat{S}_b(\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2})|^2|\chi_{x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_2})|^2 \times W(\mathbf{r}_{x_1})|\chi_{x_1}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1})|^2 \quad (13)$$

to be compared to the two-body reaction cross section of the fragment x, in the breakup of a two-cluster projectile, a = x + b,

$$\frac{E_x}{k_x}\sigma_R^x = \int d\mathbf{r}_x|\hat{S}_b(\mathbf{r}_x)|^2W(\mathbf{r}_x)|\chi_x^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_x)|^2 \quad (14)$$

where $\hat{S}_b(\mathbf{r}_x) \equiv \int d\mathbf{r}_b\langle\chi_b^{(-)}|\chi_b^{(+)}\rangle(\mathbf{r}_b)\Phi_a(\mathbf{r}_b,\mathbf{r}_x)$. One sees clearly that the 4B cross section is damped compared to the 3B one owing, among other factors, to the presence of the distorted wave density $|\chi_{x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_2})|^2$ in the former. In addition, the cross-section formula (13) applied to a three-body halo nuclei, e.g., a weakly bound neutron-neutron-core nuclei close to the drip-line, has built in a long-range correlation between the two neutrons and the core b, through the extended wave function of the halo and $|\chi_{x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_2})|^2$. If not approximated, the scattering wave function, $\Psi_0^{4B(+)}(\mathbf{r}_b,\mathbf{r}_{x_1},\mathbf{r}_{x_2})$, contains dynamics of the continuum of the neutron-neutron-core system beyond the bound halo state. The reaction mechanism now

includes Efimov physics [20] and with that the long range correlation between the halo fragments, which could be influenced by the presence of Efimov bound, virtual or resonant states [21] (see also [22] for a discussion of observing Efimov states in halo reactions). Indeed, the existence of Borromean Efimov states was observed about a decade ago [23] in the resonant three-body recombination of cold cesium atoms in magneto-optical traps.

The same considerations above can be made with respect to the cross section $\sigma_R^{x_2}$. Similar observations could be made if the IAV or UT expressions were used. It is also instructive to compare the above cross sections to the "free" one, where x is the primary projectile,

$$\frac{E}{k}\sigma_R = \int \mathbf{dr}|\chi^{(+)}(\mathbf{r})|^2 W(\mathbf{r}) \tag{15}$$

Finally the last cross section, σ_R^{3B}, is new and a genuine three-body absorption cross section. In the following we take a critical look at its structure.

Using the wisdom of conventional nuclear reaction theory, the three-body W_{3B} results from the average of processes involving the excitation of the target by one of the fragment and its de-excitation by the other fragment, as well as other processes, with the final result being the full capture, or complete fusion, of both fragments, as illustrated in Fig. 1,



FIG. 1. Three-body optical potential U_{3B}. Excitation of the target by particle x_1 and de-excitation by x_2 (see Eq. (16)).

In the language of projection operators, the 3B optical potential, U_{3B}, whose imaginary part is -W_{3B}, is given by

$$U_{3B} = PV_{x_1A}Q(QG_{x_1x_2A}(E_x)Q)QV_{x_2A}P + PV_{x_2A}Q(QG_{x_1x_2A}(E_{x_1x_2})Q)QV_{x_1A}P \tag{16}$$

where, the Q-projected 3B Green's function of the $x_1 + x_2 + A$ system, $QG_{x_1x_2A}(E_{x_1x_2})Q \equiv QG_{x_1x_2A}Q$, is given by

$$QG_{x_1x_2A}Q = \frac{1}{E_{x_1x_2} - QH_0Q + Q[V_{x_1A} + V_{x_2A}]PG_0P[V_{x_1A} + V_{x_2A}]Q + i\varepsilon} \tag{17}$$

The imaginary part of U_{3B} is now easily calculated.

$$Im[QG_{x_1x_2A}Q] = -\pi\Omega_Q^{(-)}\delta(E_x - QH_0Q)(\Omega_Q^{(-)})^\dagger + \\ + (QG_{x_1x_2A}Q)^\dagger \\ \times Q[V_{x_1A} + V_{x_2A}]\, P\delta(E_{x_1x_2} - PH_0P)P\,[V_{x_2A} + V_{x_2A}]Q \\ \times QG_{x_1x_2A}Q \tag{18}$$

Thus,

$$W_{3B} = \pi[PV_{x_1A}Q\Omega_Q^{(-)}\delta(E_x - QH_0Q) \\ (\Omega_Q^{(-)})^\dagger QV_{x_2A}P + (x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2) + \\ + PV_{x_1A}Q(QG_{x_1x_2A}Q)^\dagger Q[V_{x_1A} + V_{x_2A}]P \\ P\delta(E_x - PH_0P)P[V_{x_1A} + V_{x_2A}]Q(QG_{x_1x_2A}Q)QV_{x_2A}P + \\ + PV_{x_2A}Q(QG_{x_1x_2A}Q)^\dagger Q[V_{x_1A} + V_{x_2A}]P \\ P\delta(E_x - PH_0)P)P[V_{x_1A} + V_{x_2A}]Q(QG_{x_1x_2A}Q)QV_{x_1A}P] \tag{19}$$

Therefore the reactive content of W_{3B} is simple to discern. The first term corresponds to the already announced excitation of the target by one fragment followed by a de-excitation through the action of the second fragment. The last two terms corresponds to absorption of the two fragments by the target. There are eight terms which describe the different ways this absorption is manifested. It is evident that a detailed evaluation of U_{3B} is a formidable task. The correlation is induced by the interaction $V_{x_1x_2}$, which besides scattering the two fragments, could bind them in a resonance or quasi-bound state. Accordingly we replace the very complicated structure above by a simple effective two-body fusion. This applies to the calculation of the reaction cross section, σ_R^{3B}. Of course, we can settle on less and use the experience acquired over several decades in the description of complete fusion [24, 25] and treat the cross section σ_R^{3B}, Eq.(10), as the capture or complete fusion of the system $x_1 + x_2$ by the target, modified by the internal motion of the two fragments inside the projectile. For the purpose of illustration we use the eikonal-type approximation of the DWBA version of the four-body wave function. This entails using $\Psi^{(+4B)} \approx \chi_b^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_b)\Psi_{x_1,x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1}, \mathbf{r}_{x_2})\Phi_a(\mathbf{r}_b, \mathbf{r}_{x_1}, \mathbf{r}_{x_2})$. This then allows writing,

$$\sigma_R^{3B} = \sigma_{CF}^{3B} = \frac{(k_{x_1} + k_{x_2})}{E_{CM}(x_1, x_2)}\langle\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}|W_{3B}|\hat{\rho}_{x_1,x_2}\rangle \\ = \frac{(k_{x_1} + k_{x_2})}{E_{CM}(x_1, x_2)}\int d\mathbf{r}_{x_1}d\mathbf{r}_{x_2}|\hat{S}_b(\mathbf{r}_{x_1}, \mathbf{r}_{x_2})|^2 \\ \times \left|\Psi_{x_1,x_2}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1}, \mathbf{r}_{x_2})\right|^2 W_{3B}(\mathbf{r}_{x_1}, \mathbf{r}_{x_2})\,, \tag{20}$$

where the correlation between the x_1 and x_2 fragments are kept in the three-body scattering wave function with the target.

In this paper we have derived the 3-fragment projectile inclusive breakup cross section and pointed out the major differences from the corresponding cross section in the case of two-fragment projectile currently used in calculations. Our theory permits the study of fragment-fragment correlations through a judicious coincidence measurement of the elastic breakup part of the cross section. For the inclusive non-elastic breakup, or incomplete fusion, part of the cross section, we have derived formulae reminiscent of the so-called Austern formula, with two major differences. Our 4-body formula contains reference to the three-body nature of the fusing two fragments and to the intrinsically three-body "direct" process, which permits the excitation of the target by one of the fragments followed by the target de-excitation by the other fragment. We called the 4-body formula the CFH expression. The imaginary part of the optical potential is found to be composed of the sum of two one-fragment potentials, plus a new, 3-body part, which contains the fusion of the two fragments. We propose a simplified model to deal with this three-body absorption term in the imaginary part of this latter potential. Our results should be quite useful in the study of inclusive breakup of Borromean nuclei, where two neutrons are involved in the reaction mechanism.

Hybrid theories, such as the Surrogate Method, can now be extended to the case of, say, tritium breakup. The DWBA version of the theory is also developed. Such a distorted wave approximate requires the employment of the four-body Faddeev-Yakubovsky equations [17, 18], just as the three-body theory requires the three-body Faddeev equations [16]. This has been accomplished in the previous section and the results confirms that the general structure of the cross section is similar to the three-body case, with the full post form or the four-body IAV that can be written as the sum of the prior UT cross section plus the four-body HM one plus the interference term. The major difference between the 4B and 3B cases resides in the structure of the reaction cross sections for the absorption of one of the interacting fragments, which we find to be damped by the absorption effect of the other fragment. In general we expect that in cases such as the (t,p) reation, the one neutron absorption cross section will be smaller than the corresponding one in the (d,p) reaction.

Further, the interaction of two correlated neutrons with the target, as measured by the cross section σ_R^{3B}, could lead to the excitation of Giant Pairing Vibration (GPV) resonances, predicted in [26] and experimentally studied in light targets quite recently [27]. These collective states involve the coherent excitation of particle-particle pairs, in complete analogy to the coherent excitation of particle-hole pairs that constitutes the microscopic foundation of multipole giant resonances. The potential excitation of the GPV opens interesting prospects for nuclear structure studies in reactions of the type (t, p), the two-neutron Borromean cases, (^{6}He, ^{4}He), (^{14}Be, ^{12}Be), (^{22}C, ^{20}C), and the two-proton halo case, (^{17}Ne, ^{15}O). The theory we have developed in this paper would be the appropriate framework in which to study these types of collective nuclear excitations, associated with pairing correlations in the target and long range two-neutron Efimov correlations in the projectile.

Acknowledgements. This work was partly supported by the Brazilian agencies, Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP), the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). MSH also acknowledges a Senior Visiting Professorship granted by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES), through the CAPES/ITA-PVS program.

[1] C. A. Bertulani and M. S. Hussein, Braz. J. Phys. **45**, 730 (2015) (2015)
[2] M. Ichimura, N. Austern, and C. M. Vincent, Phys. Rev. C **32**, 431 (1985)
[3] T. Udagawa and T. Tamura, Phys. Rev. C **24**, 1348 (1981).
[4] M. S. Hussein and K. W. McVoy, Nucl. Phys. A **445**, 124 (1985)
[5] N. Austern, Y. Iseri, M. Kamimura, M. Kawai, G. Rawitscher, and M. Yahiro, Phys. Rep. **154**, 125 (1987).
[6] Q. Ducasse et al., arXiv:1512.06334 [nucl-ex]
[7] G. Potel, F. M. Nunes, and I. J. Thompson, Phys. Rev. C **92**, 034611 (2015).
[8] J. E. Escher, J. T. Burke, F. S. Dietrich, N. D. Scielzo, I. J. Thompson, and W. Younes, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 353 (2012).
[9] J. Lei and A. M. Moro, Phys. Rev. C **92**, 044616 (2015); J. Lei and A. M. Moro, C **92**, 061602(R) (2015).
[10] B.V. Carlson, R. Capote, M. Sin, Few-Body Syst. **57**, 307 (2016).
[11] R. Serber, Phys. Rev. **80**, 1098 (1950); Nature **166**, 709 (1950); Proc. Roy. Soc. **2**08 A, 55 (1951).
[12] A. Diaz-Torres, and I. J. Thompson, Phys. Rev. C, **65**, 024606 (2002).
[13] A. Kasano and M. Ichimura, Phys. Lett. B **1**15, 81 (1982).
[14] M. S. Hussein, Phys. Rev. C **3**0, 1962 (1984).
[15] M. Ichimura, Phys. Rev. C **41**, 834 (1990).
[16] M. S. Hussein, T. Frederico, and R. C. Mastroleo, Nucl. Phys. A **511**, 269 (1990).
[17] L.D.Faddeev,Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz. **39**,1459(1960)[,Sov.Phys. JETP **12**, 1014 (1961)].
[18] O. A. Yakubovsky, Yad. Fiz. **5**, 1312 (1967) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **5**, 1312 (1967)].
[19] M. S. Hussein, Ann. Phys. (NY), **175**, 197 (1987)
[20] V. Efimov, Phys. Lett. B **33**, 563 (1970) 563; Few-Body Syst. **51**, 79 (2011).
[21] T. Frederico, M.T. Yamashita, A. Delfino, L. Tomio, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **67**, 939 (2012).
[22] A. O. Macchiavelli, Few-Body Syst. **56**, 773 (2015)
[23] T. Kraemer, et al., Nature **440**, 315 (2006).

[24] L. F. Canto, P. R. S. Gomes, R. Donangelo, and M. S. Hussein, Phys. Rep. **424**, 1 (2006)
[25] L. F. Canto, P. R. S. Gomes, R. Donangelo, J. Lubian, M. S. Hussein, Phys. Rep. **596**, 1 (2015)
[26] R. A. Broglia and D. R. Bes, Phys. Lett. B **69**, 129 (1977)
[27] Cappuzzello F, Carbone D, Cavallaro M, Bond' M, Agodi C, Azaiez F, Bonaccorso A, Cunsolo A, Fortunato L, Foti A, Franchoo S, Khan E, Linares R, Lubian J, Scarpaci J A and Vitturi A, Nature Communications, **6**, (2015) 6743